

REMARKS

Entry of the foregoing, re-examination and reconsideration of the subject matter identified in caption, as amended, pursuant to and consistent with 37 C.F.R. §1.111, and in light of the remarks which follow, are respectfully requested.

By the present amendment, page 5 of the specification has been amended to correct errors in translation. No new matter has been added.

Claims 8, 9 and 12 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1-3, 5, 6 have been amended, and claims 13-15 have been added. Support for the amendments to claims 1, 2 and 5 may be found at page 7, lines 21-22 and 25-27 and on page 16, lines 11-21 of the specification. Support for new claim 13 may be found at page 5, lines 19-24 and page 14, line 25 to page 15, line 6. Support for new claims 14 and 15 may be found at page 16, lines 16-18. Claims 1-7, 10, 11 and 13-15 are now pending in this application.

Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, for the reasons set forth in paragraph (4) of the Office Action. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Claim 5 has been amended for clarification purposes in response to the Examiner's comments. It is submitted that claim 5, as currently amended, is free of the terminology objected to by the Examiner.

In view of the above, the §112, second paragraph rejection has been obviated and should be withdrawn.

Claims 1-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by EP Patent No. 1264685A (Nakahara) for the reasons set forth in paragraph (6) of the Office Action. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are requested for at least the following reasons.

The drawn film of the present invention has at least one outermost layer (A) which comprises a copolymer of 4-methyl-1-pentene and at least one comonomer of ethylene or an α -olefin having 3 to 20 carbon atoms with the proviso that the α -olefin is not 4-methyl-1-pentene. The copolymer comprises 80 mole percent or more of 4-methyl-1-pentene units and layer (A) does not substantially comprise a wax or an organic silicone compound. The drawn film has a peel area of 50 % or more where the peel area is as defined in claim 1.

In another embodiment, the drawn film has a thermal coefficient of contraction of 20% or more along the direction in which the film is drawn; *see* claim 2.

The drawn film may be produced by drawing, 4.3 times or more, a sheet comprising the layer (A) and a layer (B) which is formed on the layer (A), and then peeling the layer (B) from the layer (A). The layer (B) comprises a different thermoplastic resin, specifically polypropylene and/or polyethylene. This drawn multi-layer film before the removal of layer (B) preferably has a peel strength between layers (A) and (B) of 500 g/15 mm or less.

EP 1 264 685 A1 discloses a multi-layer film composed of a layer (A) of a 4-methyl-1-pentene copolymer and a polyethylene or polypropylene layer (B). This multi-layer film is produced by stretching a multi-layer sheet wherein the layer (A) is provided on each surface of the layer (B) (claim 1). Further, JP-A-73588/1991, referred in EP '685 discloses a single layer film obtained by uniaxially stretching a 4-methyl-1-pentene copolymer single layer film (paragraph 0007). The single layer film is described as having inferior properties.

In EP '685, the multi-layered film is stretched to give a stretched film composed of outer layers (A) and a middle layer (B). In contrast, in the present invention, a sheet composed of layers (A) and (B) where the outermost layer is the layer (B) is drawn, and then the layer (B) is peeled from the layer (A) to give the drawn film in which an outermost layer is the layer (A). Accordingly, the process for producing the drawn film of the invention

clearly differs from those for producing the films of the EP '685 reference. Further, the drawn films produced by the process of the present invention have significantly different properties from the drawn films produced in EP '685.

Specifically, in Example 1 of the present specification, a sheet of layer (B)/layer (A)/layer (B) was drawn at a draw ratio of 5 times and then the layers (B) were peeled from the layer (A) to give a drawn film of single layer (A). This drawn film had a peeling area of 60 % and a thermal coefficient of contraction of 22 % (Table 1). On the other hand, in Comparative Example 3 of the present specification, a sheet of a single layer (A) was drawn at a draw ratio of 5 times to give a drawn film of single layer (A) . This drawn film had a peeling area of 25 % and a thermal coefficient of contraction of 18 % (Table 1). Thus, the process of the EP '685 reference does not provide a drawn film having a peel area of 50 % or more and a thermal coefficient of contraction of 20% or more.

Further, with respect to peel strength, the peel strength recited in claim 13 is not the peel strength between the claimed drawn film (A) and the layer (B), but is the peel strength between the layers (A) and (B) in the drawn multi-layer film before peeling layer (B). The reference fails to disclose a drawn multi-layer film having a peel strength between the layers (A) and (B) of 500 g/15 mm or less before layer (B) is peeled to give the drawn film as claimed.

In view of the above, the §102 rejection over EP '685 should be reconsidered and withdrawn. Such action is earnestly solicited.

From the foregoing, further and favorable action in the form of a Notice of Allowance is believed to be next in order and such action is earnestly solicited. If there are any

questions concerning this paper or the application in general, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (703) 838-6683 at his earliest convenience.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL PC

Date: May 5, 2006

By: George F. Lesmes
George F. Lesmes
Registration No. 19,995

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(703) 836-6620